

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/748,240	12/31/2003	Ryoichi Aoyama	OKI 395	6971	
23995 7.	590 06/13/2005		EXAMINER		
RABIN & Berdo, PC			NGUYEN, HUNG		
1101 14TH STREET, NW SUITE 500		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2851		
			DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005	DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	10/748,240	AOYAMA ET AL.				
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit	_			
	Hung Henry V. Nguyen	2851				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 31 May 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o this application, applicant must timely file one of the follo places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a No (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in comp following time periods: 	wing replies: (1) an amendment, a otice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	ffidavit, or other evidence, which compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or				
 a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv 		e final rejection, whichever is later. In no				
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b).	an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of	f the final rejection.				
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on peen filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened states above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three month pearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	and the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension fee under 37 final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b)				
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any estimates a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be AMENDMENTS 	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.				
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, 	but prior to the date of filing a brie	f. will not be entered because				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for						
appeal; and/or	tter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	•	jected claims.				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.15. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	ompliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s). 		, timely filed amendment canceling				
7. To purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:	☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ w vided below or appended.	ill be entered and an explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be	ut before or on the date of filing a N	Notice of Appeal will not be entered				
because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).		•				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fails to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attached.				
 The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet. 	it does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowance because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper	No(s)				
		Hung Henry V Names	_			
•	/	Hung Henry V Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2851				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's response filed May 31, 2005 have been carefully reviewed and considered but they are not found persuasive.

With respect to applicant's arguments in sections (1); (2); the Examiner respectfully disagrees. Claims 1, 4, 7, 10-13 and 15-22 of the present invention are met under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection under the reference of Mori since as indicated in the prosecution history of the present clase, Mori teaches for the purpose of photo cleaning, arranging at a position where the reticle is to be placed, at least one of a disfusion plate (72), concave lens (216), and convex lens (212). Mori further teaches "it will be understood by one skilled in the art that the above-described embodiment of the invention using concave lens 216 and convex lens 212, is not so limited. For example, any optical member having a positive or negative refractive power can be used. In addition, a reflecting optical member (e.g., a mirror) having reflecting power may be provided on the illumination optical system side as the photo-cleaning optical member." (see col.28, lines 24-28). In view of such teachings, it is the Examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to employ a Fresnel lens having either a lens-shaped concave portion/or convex portion on the other surface, onto the system/method of Mori, for clearning the projection efficiently.

In response to argument in section (3) that the applicant's transmittable plate has two different surfaces, the plate can be thinner than the transmittable plate shown in Mori as described in the current specification on lines 1-3, the Applicant is reminded that the limitations on which applicant relies (i.e., the applicant's plate can be thinner than ...) are not stated in the claims. It is the claims that define the claimed invention, and it is claims, not specifications that are anticipated or unpatentable. Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices Inc., 7 USPQ2d 1064.

Finally, the underlining of "and the like" (on page 3, line 7 of the previous office action) is to emphasize that any optical member having a positive or negative refractive power can be included. (For example, in this case, because a Fresnel lens is an optical lens having a positive or a negative refractive power, therefore, it can be used and modified, as photo-cleaning member as suggested by Mori).